

N -point correlations in CDM and Ω CDM Simulations

István Szapudi¹, Thomas Quinn², Joachim Stadel², and George Lake²

¹University of Durham, Department of Physics South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, United Kingdom

² Department of Astronomy, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1580

Abstract

Higher order statistics are investigated in (Ω) CDM universes by analyzing $500h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ high resolution tree N -body simulations with both $\Omega = 1$, and $\Omega < 1$. The amplitudes of the N -point correlation functions are calculated from moments of counts-in-cells determined by a pair of new algorithms especially developed for large simulations. This approach enables massive oversampling with $\simeq 10^{9-14}$ cells for accurate determination of factorial moments from up to 47 million particles in the scale range of $8h^{-1}\text{kpc} - 125h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. Thorough investigation shows that there are three scale ranges in the simulations: $\geq 8h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, weakly non-linear regime, where perturbation theory applies with utmost precision, $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc} - 8h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, the non-linear plateau, and finally $\leq 1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, a regime where dynamical discreteness effects dominate the higher order statistics. In the physically relevant range of $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc} - 125h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ the results i) confirm the validity of perturbation theory in the weakly non-linear regime, ii) establish the existence of a plateau in the highly non-linear regime similar to the one observed in scale free simulations iii) show extended perturbation theory to be an excellent approximation for the non-linear regime iv) find the time dependence of the S_N 's to be negligible in both regimes v) in comparison with similar measurements in the EDSGC survey, strongly support $\Omega < 1$ with no biasing vi) show that the formulae of Szapudi & Colombi (1996) provide a good approximation for errors on higher order statistics measured in N -body simulations.

keywords large scale structure of the universe – galaxies: clustering – methods: numerical – methods: statistical

1. Introduction

According to popular theories of structure formation, the distribution of mass in the universe grows by gravity from initially Gaussian fluctuations. The resulting distribution is described in a statistical way, most importantly via two-point and higher order correlation functions, which can be studied theoretically using analytical methods, or numerical experiments. Although the comparison of the results with observations is somewhat complicated by the fact that galaxies

do not necessarily trace mass (biasing), the manifold information contained in the higher order correlations in principle enables the separation of gravitational amplification from other processes (e.g., Fry 1994, Matarrese, Verde, & Heavens 1997, Scoccimarro *et al.* 1998, Frieman & Gaztañaga 1998, Scoccimarro, Szapudi, & Frieman 1998, Szapudi 1998).

Following the pioneering work of Peebles and collaborators (e.g., Fry & Peebles 1978, Peebles 1980 and references therein), perturbation theory became the prime analytical tool to study higher order correlation functions. The Euler equations for a gravitating fluid are expanded around small fluctuations to predict the amplitudes of the correlation functions at weakly non-linear scales. In contrast, N -body simulations calculate the gravitational amplification directly; thus, up to numerical accuracy, they follow the full non-linear evolution. Simulations not only yield beautiful agreement with perturbation theory at large scales, but also penetrate the highly non-linear evolution of smaller scales. These scales are especially important, since, except for the largest galaxy catalogs, most observations are performed at small or intermediate scales. The method of moments of counts in cells is especially useful for comparison, since the moments were calculated in the framework of perturbation theory (e.g., Peebles 1980, Juszkiewicz, Bouchet, & Colombi 1993, Bernardeau 1992, Bernardeau 1994, Bernardeau 1995), measured in N -body simulations (e.g., Bouchet, Schaeffer, & Davis 1991, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1992, Baugh, Gaztañaga, & Efstathiou, Gaztañaga, & Baugh 1995, Colombi, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1995), and galaxy catalogs as well (e.g., Peebles 1980, Gaztañaga 1992, Szapudi, Szalay & Boschán 1992, Meiksin, Szapudi, & Szalay 1992, Bouchet *et al.* 1993, Gaztañaga 1994, Szapudi *et al.* 1995, Szapudi, Meiksin, & Nichol 1996, Kim, & Strauss 1997, Szapudi & Szalay 1997a).

While the simplest version of Λ CDM initial conditions appears to be excluded by observations of the variance as measured by the Cosmic Microwave Background, cluster abundances, pair-wise velocities, and galaxy clustering, it is the qualitatively most successful theory, to which every other theory is measured. In this work large, high resolution CDM simulations are used in an attempt to understand clustering with unprecedented errors in a large dynamic range. Motivated by observations, a low density variant of CDM (Ω CDM) is investigated as well, since it is one of the most viable alternatives at present.

Moments of counts in cells are used to quantify higher order clustering in the simulations. Similar previous measurements are improved upon in several ways: a large $500h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ box size is used to diminish finite volume effects, i.e. the error on the measurement from fluctuations of the universe on scales larger than the box size; 47×10^6 particles are used for a large dynamic range; a pair of new methods are employed calculate counts in cells, which are especially designed for large simulations and to minimize the measurement errors; for quantitative assessment of the accuracy a strict theoretical error analysis is performed according the formalism of Szapudi & Colombi (1996 hereafter SC), and Szapudi, Colombi, & Bernardeau (1998, hereafter SCB). Because of the above properties the measurements are relevant to study both the highly and mildly non-linear regimes as well as the transition between them. Special care is taken to determine the scales of reliability, and appropriate tests are done to estimate the artificial two-body relaxation effects, which appear to be the limiting factor at small scales.

The organization of the paper is as follows. The next § outlines the method of counts in cells as used here. §3 describes the simulations and establishes the scales of reliability. §4 presents the measurements of the cumulants in the various simulations. §5 discusses findings in terms of perturbation theory (PT) and extended perturbation theory (EPT) providing an efficient framework to compress the results and facilitating the comparison with observational data from the EDSGC survey. The Appendix contains the definition of the pair of algorithms used to calculate counts in cells.

2. Method

A substantially improved version of the counts in cells method is used in this work.¹ It consists of calculating the amplitudes of higher order correlation functions in a sequence of three consecutive steps: estimation of the probability distribution, calculation of the factorial moments, and extraction of the normalized, averaged amplitudes of the N -point correlation functions, the S_N 's. The relevant definitions and theory is briefly summarized below, while Szapudi, Meiksin, & Nichol 1996, and references therein can be consulted for more details.

Let P_N is the probability that a randomly thrown cell in the simulation contains N particles, with implicit dependence on the cell size ℓ . The estimator for this is the frequency distribution

$$\tilde{P}_N = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=1}^C \delta(N_i = N), \quad (1)$$

where C is the number of cells thrown and N_i is the number of objects in cell i . It is desirable to use as many cells as possible, since for large C the measurement errors associated with the finite number of cells behave as C^{-1} (SC). Here the main improvement over the more traditional approach is the pair of algorithms described in the Appendix, which enable us to use $C \simeq 10^{9-14}$ even in these large simulations.

The factorial moments (see e.g. Szapudi & Szalay 1993) may be obtained from the probability distribution using

$$F_k = \sum P_N (N)_k, \quad (2)$$

where $(N)_k = N(N-1)\dots(N-k+1)$ is the k -th falling factorial of N . The F_k 's directly estimate the moments of the hypothetical continuum random field which is Poisson sampled by the simulation particles. This is the most accurate and efficient way of subtracting shot noise, which becomes important on small scales. Note, that for estimation purposes, the estimator of the probability distribution is substituted in the above equation, i.e. $\tilde{P}_N \rightarrow P_N$.

The average of the N -point angular correlation functions on a scale ℓ is defined by

$$\bar{\xi}_N(\ell) = V^{-N} \int dV_1 \dots dV_N \xi_N(r_1, \dots, r_N), \quad (3)$$

¹ Note that in an N -body simulation edge effects are eliminated by the periodic boundary conditions, therefore the edge corrected estimator of Szapudi & Szalay 1998 is not necessary.

where ξ_N is the N -point correlation function in the simulations and V is the volume of a cell. We define S_N in the usual way,

$$S_N = \frac{\bar{\xi}_N}{\bar{\xi}_2^{N-1}}. \quad (4)$$

The factorial moments have an especially simple relation to the S_N 's through the recursion relation (Szapudi & Szalay 1993), which is quoted for completeness:

$$S_k = \frac{F_k \bar{\xi}_2}{N_c^k} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{q=1}^{k-1} \frac{(k-q) S_{k-q} F_q \binom{k}{q}}{N_c^q}, \quad (5)$$

where $N_c = \langle N \rangle \bar{\xi}_2$.

The most critical and CPU intensive component of the above procedure is the calculation of counts in cells with appropriate oversampling. While there exists an algorithm for infinitely oversampling by Szapudi 1997, it would be impractical for 47 million particles in three dimensions. Therefore, a new approach was developed especially for large simulations: the resulting pair of algorithms for smaller and larger scales have substantial overlap at intermediate scales suitable for testing. They are detailed in the Appendix. With a modest 6 – 8 hours of CPU investment, these algorithms can achieve $C \simeq 10^{9-14}$ sampling cells simultaneously at a hierarchy of scales between $1/65536 - 1/4$ of the simulation box size.

3. Measurements

Label	Ω	H_0 (km/s/Mpc)	σ_8	L_{box} (h^{-1} Mpc)	N	ϵ (h^{-1} kpc)	l_{50} (h^{-1} Mpc)
I_a	1.0	50	.5	500.0	4.7×10^7	50.0	4
I_b	1.0	50	.7	500.0	4.7×10^7	50.0	2
I_c	1.0	50	1.0	500.0	4.7×10^7	50.0	1
II_a	0.5	75	.74	500.0	4.7×10^7	50.0	3
II_b	0.4	75	.88	500.0	4.7×10^7	50.0	1.3
II_c	0.3	75	1.0	500.0	4.7×10^7	50.0	≤ 1
i_{c0}	1.0	50	1.0	500.0	3.0×10^6	160.0	13
$i_{c1} \dots i_{c5}$	1.0	50	1.0	200.0	3.0×10^6	50.0	1

Table 1: The simulations analyzed are summarized in this table. Ω is the density parameter, H_0 is the Hubble constant, σ_8 is the RMS density fluctuation in $8h^{-1}$ Mpc spheres, L_{box} is the size of the periodic box, N is the number of particles, and ϵ is the force softening length. Note that $i_{c1} \dots i_{c5}$ are five different realizations of the same initial conditions.

3.1. Simulations

The characteristics of the simulations used are summarized in table 1. The box size, particle number, and force softening of the large simulations were chosen to model the formation of galaxy clusters in a volume of the universe comparable to that to be surveyed by the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS, Gunn & Knapp 1993). All simulations were computed using PKDGRAV, (Stadel and Quinn, in preparation) a scalable parallel treecode with periodic boundary conditions. Accurate forces were maintained by using a cell opening angle of $\theta = 0.8$ for $z < 2$ and $\theta = .6$ for $z > 2$, and expanding the potentials of cells to hexadecapole order. Timesteps were constrained to $\Delta t < 0.3(\epsilon/v_{max})$, where ϵ is the softening length and v_{max} is the approximate maximum speed. A cubic spline softening kernel was used. The simulations were started at $z = 49$ for the $\sigma_8 = 1$ models, thus the transients from initial conditions should be negligible (Scoccimarro 1998). The same simulations were also used by Governato *et al.* 1998 to explore the properties of galaxy clusters. Note that I_a , I_b , and I_c are the same simulation at different output times. II_a , II_b , and II_c are likewise. Simulations $i_{c1} \dots i_{c5}$ are an ensemble of simulations with different realizations of the same initial power spectrum.

3.2. Scales of Reliability

Since both algorithms in the Appendix employ powers of 2, initially the scale range of $2^{-16} \dots 2^{-2}$ times box size was used for calculating counts in cells, corresponding to $7.63h^{-1}\text{kpc} - 125h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. The lower scale is smaller than the softening length used for force calculation. With our algorithm A2 for small scales we could obtain almost arbitrarily small scales for free. The upper scale still contains 256 non-overlapping volumes, sufficient for a distribution not far from Gaussian. Figure 1 shows the the counts in cells distribution for simulation I_c . The curves from right to left correspond to scales of $1/4, 1/8, \dots, 1/65536$ L (the box size). Algorithm A1 was used for scales down to $1/512$ L, and A2 for smaller scales. A1 uses a fixed number of cells $C \simeq 1.1 \cdot 10^9$ for all scales, while A2 increases C 8-fold at each step towards smaller scales after starting with the above value. This is reflected on Figure 1 by the lowest possible value P_N can take. The tail of the distribution still shows some wavering which could be smoothed out with even higher oversampling. The next §, however, will show that the resulting measurement errors are much smaller than the theoretical variance of the simulations, thus the sampling is sufficient. The high degree of oversampling was made possible only by the algorithms of the Appendix specifically developed for this purpose.

The upper panel of Figure 2 shows the variance, or the average two point correlation function over a cell, as calculated from the first two factorial moments of simulation I_c . The solid curve is algorithm A1, while the joining dashed line shows algorithm A2. The triangles and squares display the expected variance in cubic windows obtained by integrating the linear and non-linear power spectrum, respectively (Peacock & Dodds 1996; the non-linear $P(k)$ was provided by Carlton Baugh, private communication). The fitting formula for the non-linear power spectrum provides a good approximation, the largest discrepancy being roughly 30% on the smallest scales. The

lower resolution simulation, discussed later, and represented with dotted line and the figure, is in even better agreement with the fitting formula. While providing a more accurate fitting formula for high resolution simulations could be a topic of further investigation, this work concentrates on higher order statistics, the second order moment is only shown as a test.

The higher order factorial moments were calculated as well from the counts in cells according §2. The resulting S_N 's up to 9th order are displayed on Figure 3. Again, the solid and the continuing dash lines are the results from the two algorithms of the Appendix for small and large scales. Note the excellent agreement in the overlap, despite the fact that the sampling is somewhat different because of the random shifts employed in A2.

Qualitatively one can distinguish three regimes on Figure 3. The dot-dash lines display theoretical predictions from perturbation theory (Juszkiewicz, Bouchet, & Colombi 1993, Bernardeau 1994) up to sixth order. The agreement is excellent from scales upward of $8h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, in the weakly non-linear regime. Between $1 - 8h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, in the highly non-linear regime, the S_N 's are higher than the perturbation theory prediction because of enhanced non-linear effects. They constitute a shallow plateau in agreement with previous results from scale invariant simulations (Colombi, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1995). Finally downward from $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ there seems to be a third regime with a steeper rise. As illustrated next, this is caused by artificial particle discreteness effects.

The lower panel of Figure 2. plots $N_c = \overline{\xi N}$, the number of particles in a typical cluster, as a function of scale. N_c indicates how well the simulation represents the fluid limit. For small values the dynamics in typical clusters is artificially dominated by particle discreteness effects, a dynamical shot noise (Colombi, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1995). Such effects do not represent real physics since particles in the simulation should follow the dynamics of the underlying smooth field. Indeed, at scales smaller than $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ N_c becomes fairly small, which is likely to explain the sharp rise in the S_N 's.

To test this idea several auxiliary CDM simulations were run with 3 million particles, and the S_N 's were measured. Simulation i_{c0} had the same initial conditions and box size as the main simulation, therefore the shot noise is expected to turn up the S_N 's on larger scales, if the above explanation is correct. According to the dotted line on the lower panel of Figure 2, which displays N_c for i_{c0} , the break is expected to happen at around $10 - 15h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, if the suspected scaling with N_c is correct. Indeed, this seems to be the case for the dotted lines on Figure 3, supporting the role of particle discreteness in the artificial increase of the higher order cumulants.

For another test a set of 5 simulations were run, $i_{c1} \dots i_{c5}$. They had smaller box size $200^3 h^{-1}\text{Mpc}^3$, to keep the average number of particles the same as the original simulation. The initial conditions were independently generated for each realization. The ensemble average of these simulations is expected to yield the same results upward from $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ as the original simulation, perhaps with less accuracy because of the enhanced cosmic error caused by the smaller volume (SC). These measurements are displayed as triangles on Figure 3. The errorbars were calculated by estimating the dispersion of the five simulations $i_{c1} - i_{c5}$; only the upper errorbar is displayed

for clarity. The results are in excellent agreement with the expectations, further supporting the idea that the third regime at small scales is a sign of dynamical discreteness effects.

Colombi, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1995 found that if l_c is defined by $N_c(l_c) = 1$, a sufficient condition for the fluid limit is $l \geq 1.5l_c$. The location of the break in the curves suggest a slightly more conservative limit such that $N_c(l_{50}) = 50$. This somewhat ambiguous prescription depends on the details of the simulation and the desired precision of the agreement between the fluid limit and the measurements at each order. Our choice corresponds to $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ as the scale of reliability. Note that the accuracy depends on the order, deteriorating towards the higher moments. It seems more logical to relax the required precision towards higher order than to define a set of scales of reliability becoming larger with higher order. This somewhat arbitrary but natural choice of $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ is adopted for the measurements performed in the rest of the simulations, but l_{50} is given for reference in Table 1 for each output. Note also, that for the two-point correlation function only, a smaller N_c , and a correspondingly smaller scale, is sufficient (see e.g., Jain 1997).

4. Results

According to the previous reasoning, it is meaningful to extract higher order correlations down to $\simeq 1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ only, thus only algorithm A1 was sufficient for the rest of the measurements. Although the force resolution would suggest a lower threshold, as detailed above, particle discreteness effects raise the scale of reliability. Six outputs of two high resolution CDM simulations summarized in Table 1 ($I_a, I_b, I_c, II_a, II_b, II_c$) were used to measure counts in cells on scales between $1 - 125h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$.

The measurements of the S_N 's are displayed in Figures 4 with solid lines, which is the main

l ($h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$)	I_a	I_b	I_c	II_a	II_b	II_c
0.976	7.98	6.45	5.73	10.22	8.43	7.94
1.953	6.41	5.57	5.00	8.49	7.60	7.05
3.9	4.61	4.55	4.38	6.09	6.24	6.08
7.81	3.47	3.54	3.56	4.30	4.54	4.78
15.625	2.87	2.89	2.93	3.38	3.51	3.68
31.25	2.43	2.47	2.52	2.87	2.94	2.99
62.5	1.87	1.92	1.96	2.20	2.25	2.29
125	3.34	2.40	2.07	2.07	2.03	2.00

Table 2: The measurements of S_3 in the different simulations are tabulated. l is the size of the cubical window in which counts in cells where measured. The properties of simulations can be found in Table 1.

result of this paper. The $\Omega = 1$, and $\Omega < 1$ simulations are displayed on the left, and right hand side, respectively. For reference, the measured S_3 and S_4 are given in Tables 2 and 3 as well. The weakly non-linear regime on large scales is distinguished from the non-linear plateau at small scales in all cases. The behavior of the higher order moments is qualitatively similar to scale invariant simulations (Colombi, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1995). Perturbation theory predicts that the S_N 's are independent of the output times. This appears to be a good approximation even in the highly non-linear regime, especially down to scales of l_{50} . For instance for the $\Omega = 1$ simulations on $4h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ (l_{50} for I_a) S_3 changes only about 5%, which is the same order as the errors. Even S_{10} is constant within a factor of 2-3, i.e. the higher order moments are constant within the errors (see next subsection). The decreasing trend on small scales can be explained by contamination effects from particle discreteness. As the scale of reliability moves to the left for the more relaxed, later simulations, the S_N 's decrease slightly. These initial observations will be refined by comparing with the predictions of PT and EPT in the next section, after the error budget is detailed in the next subsection.

4.1. Errors

According to SC, the errors on the previous results can be classified into measurement errors and cosmic errors.

The measurement errors arise from a finite number of cells, C , being used to estimate the distribution of counts in cells. The appropriate expression for the error generating function is (see SC for details):

$$E(x, y) = \frac{1}{C} [P(xy) - P(x)P(y)]. \quad (6)$$

The expansion of this equation yields the measurement error in the N -th moment, which depends on the $2N$ -th moment. If $C \rightarrow \infty$, the contribution approaches 0 as expected. We used this equation self-consistently to obtain errors up to 5th order (since 10th order moments were measured). The measurement error is largest at the smallest scales. Figure 5 shows the relative

l ($h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$)	I_a	I_b	I_c	II_a	II_b	II_c
0.976	121.1	74.8	58.1	222.7	133.6	121.5
1.953	80.0	56.7	44.7	154.4	115.2	96.5
3.9	41.4	38.7	34.7	80.7	80.8	74.1
7.81	21.5	22.5	21.8	36.9	40.4	46.7
15.625	13.4	13.6	14.2	20.1	22.5	25.7
31.25	9.1	9.6	10.2	13.8	14.4	14.8

Table 3: Same as Table 2. for S_4

measurement error as a function of order for the $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ scale for I_c . Since there is a convex curvature on the graph, the continuing dotted line is a conservative overestimation of the errors for the orders $N > 5$. This suggest that even at 10th order the measurement errors contribute less than 10%, thus a further increase in the sampling is not required. This finding is true for the other simulations as well.

Cosmic errors are an inherent property of the simulations and cannot be improved upon, except by using a larger volume or an ensemble of realizations. This type of error can be classified into finite volume, discreteness, and edge effects (SC). They arise respectively from the (hypothetical) fluctuations on scales larger than the simulation, the finite number of particles used to model the density field, and the uneven weighting of points. Due to the periodic boundary conditions, edge effects are not significant; neither are discreteness effects except for the smallest scales because of the large number of particles used. Therefore finite volume effects are expected to be the dominant contribution, if systematic errors from the inaccuracy of the calculations are not considered.

Two methods were used for estimating the cosmic errors: measuring the dispersion numerically from the ensemble of simulations $i_{c1} \dots i_{c5}$ (see the errorbars in Figure 3), and using the theory of (SC, SCB) to estimate the errors from the measured higher order moments self-consistently up to 4th order. The details of the calculations can be found there; here we only summarize the basic idea.

SC calculated the generating function of the variance of factorial moments due to edge, discreteness, and finite volume effects. Since the connected moments can be expressed in terms of the factorial moments (which are the discrete version of the disconnected moments), their results can be used to express the errors on the connected moments (see SCB for more details). The resulting formulae express the errors on the N -th order connected moments in terms of the $2N$ -th connected moments for $N \leq 4$. The expressions are too complicated to quote here (they are over 500 lines long); therefore, only the self-consistent numerical estimates are used. For the case of the connected moments it is not possible to simply separate the different contributions for the errors. Therefore, discreteness and edge effects are included in the calculations, even though this way the errors could be overestimated at large scales according to the previous considerations.

Figure 6 compares the numerical estimates of the theoretical error calculation (see also Colombi, Szapudi *et al.* 1998) The solid line displays the unbiased estimate of the variance for S_3 , and S_4 , while the dotted lines show the theoretical calculation of the errors in the individual simulations $i_{c1} \dots i_{c5}$. The dashes are the result of a theoretical calculation as well, but using the ensemble average of the five simulations for the moments. While the theoretical estimates from the individual simulations are in excellent agreement with the empirical dispersion, the average of the five simulations curiously overestimates the errors, especially on larger scales. A possible explanation is that since the error distribution is skewed (SC), a few overshoots can dominate the average. This is amplified by the non-linear expressions used to estimate the errors. The agreement nevertheless is surprisingly good, despite the anticipated 'error on the error' problem (SC): the error on the 4-th order moment depends on 8-th order quantities, and the error on the

error depends on up to 16-th order moments. To determine empirically the errors with negligible variance, 16 orders should be controlled with high precision, which is hardly possible using only 5 simulations of this size. For instance, in SC 1000 subsamples were needed to control the error on the error. Nevertheless, we can draw from the figure the conclusion that the theoretical calculations for the *individual* simulations are in excellent agreement with the empirical dispersion. We generalize this finding to the other simulations, where an ensemble of realizations is not presently available; i.e. we assume that the theoretical calculation is a good estimate of the errors up to 4-th order. The error calculation yields less than 1 % error for S_3 and about 5 % for S_4 at most scales, except perhaps at the largest scales, where the errors appear to turn up to few tens of %.

In fact for simulation I_c , which has the exact same properties as simulations $i_{c1} \dots i_{c5}$ except larger, it is interesting to try the following naïve scaling: if, as argued above, finite volume effects dominate, the errors on the disconnected moments scale with the variance over the full box, $\sqrt{\xi(L)}$. Even though for the connected moments the formulae are more complicated, we find empirically that scaling with $2\sqrt{\xi(L)}$ is an excellent approximation for the errors. Moreover, it appears that the earlier outputs have the same absolute error, i.e. the same scaling. Encouraged by these findings, a similar scaling was applied to the $\Omega < 1$ simulations. Again, scaling the $2\sqrt{\xi(L)}$ of the last output is an excellent approximation. These observations are valid at the factor of 2 level: a considerable accuracy if the arguments about the “error on the error” are taken into account. We conjecture that similar approximations can be used at higher order.

5. Discussion

The approximations developed for the errors in the previous section facilitate the comparison of the results with observations. The framework for comparison is naturally provided by perturbation theory (PT) and its generalization for smaller scales, extended perturbation theory (EPT). PT gives simple expressions for the higher order correlation amplitudes S_N at any order N . For instance for the third order quantity $S_3 = 34/7 - (n + 3)$ (see, e.g., Juszkiewicz, Bouchet, & Colombi 1993), where n is the local index of the power spectrum. This formula, and the corresponding ones for higher order, can *formally* be used at small scales where PT is not expected to hold. It was observed in scale invariant N -body simulations (Colombi, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1995, Colombi *et al.* 1996) and observations (Szapudi, Meiksin, & Nichol 1996), that this formal procedure gives an excellent fit for the higher order cumulants, even though the resulting n_{eff} is no longer the local slope of the power spectrum; rather, it is a formal parameter which proves to be extremely useful for characterizing data. In scale invariant simulations it was found that a steepening occurs in terms of n_{eff} , i.e. the distribution in terms of its cumulants at non-linear scales is equivalent to another weakly non-linear distribution but with a steeper power spectrum.

The solid lines in Figure 8 show the least square fit for n_{eff} in all the large simulations. Up to sixth order quantities were used, and the errorbars were obtained formally by calculating n_{eff} from S_3 alone. This takes into account the inaccuracy of the higher order moments relative to the

third order moments, as well as the possible variance in EPT, an approximate phenomenological relation. This prescription, however, cannot account for any absolute errors on the measurements of the S_N 's. Figure 8, the most sensitive summary of the results of the paper, shows n_{eff} on a *linear* scale.

The upper three solid lines correspond to I_a, I_b, I_c , in increasing order on scales of $2h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, the lower three to II_a, II_b, II_c , in decreasing order on scales of $15h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. The $\Omega = 1$, and $\Omega < 1$ simulation groups are tightly together, while the two groups differ from each other. In the weakly non-linear regime the agreement is excellent between PT theory and the measured S_N 's, since the n_{eff} is extremely close to the theoretical slope of the power spectrum: the upper dashed line shows the theoretical prediction for $\Omega = 1$, and the lower three dashed lines show the prediction for $\Omega < 1$, for II_a, II_b, II_c in decreasing order. Note that the actual Ω dependence of the S_N 's, which is extremely small, (Bouchet *et al.* 1992) was not taken into account for the theoretical prediction; simply the local slope of the power spectrum is plotted. Since the power spectrum is slightly different for the $\Omega < 1$ simulations, they behave differently in this regime. Because of non-linearities at smaller scales, PT is not a good approximation; however, EPT still is. This can be seen from Figure 4, where triangles show the S_N 's formally corresponding to the fitted n_{eff} . The agreement is excellent above l_{50} on all figures, except perhaps for II_c where it is only a good approximation above $2l_{50}$ for the higher orders. Thus n_{eff} at each scale is good representation of the data, providing a natural framework for comparison. In the highly non-linear regime, a steepening compared to the PT value is present, which is apparent relative to the dashed line on the Figure. This is very similar to the effect observed in scale invariant simulations by Colombi, Bouchet, & Hernquist 1995. Note also that as the simulations become more relaxed, EPT becomes more accurate. This suggests that the break down at small scales is caused only by inaccuracies introduced by dynamical discreteness effects at small scales. In Figure 8 the same effect shows up as a fan-like spreading of the curves, corresponding to a slight decrease of the S_N 's as a function of time, as discussed before. When particle discreteness is accounted for, the S_N 's appear to be approximately time-independent to a degree similar to the weakly non-linear regime even at highly non-linear scales. On the other hand, the difference between the two types of simulations is real, as it is observed at the reliable scales. Note that by construction the errorbars of the Figure cannot reflect systematics from particle discreteness.

The framework provided by n_{eff} is ideal for comparison with observations. The same type of calculation was performed by Szapudi, Meiksin, & Nichol 1996 using the EDSGC survey. Their results agree well with the corresponding S_N 's from the APM survey (Gaztañaga 1994, Szapudi 1998). The n_{eff} from the EDSGC is plotted with dotted lines. Although the split between the different output times could be artificial, as noted above, the difference between the $\Omega = 1$ and $\Omega < 1$ simulations is real. The comparison with the EDSGC data clearly favors the $\Omega < 1$ curves. Note a subtlety of the comparison shown here: the scales given with the deprojected S_N 's in Szapudi, Meiksin, & Nichol 1996 are simply $D\theta$, where $D = 370h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ is the depth of the catalog, and θ is the angle of the sides of the square window used for counts in cell. Since the simulation uses cubical cells, the comparison with $D\theta$ is not appropriate. On the figure a simple approximation is used: the volume of the effective cone (or pyramid) is equated to the

volume of the cells in the simulations. More precisely, $D^3\theta^2/3 = l^3$ was assumed, where l is the side of the cubes in the simulations. If θ_{deg} is expressed in degrees, the scale transformation is $l = 35.9\theta_{deg}^{2/3}h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ as opposed to the usual $l = 6.5\theta_{deg}h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. Comparing the volumes should be a reasonable approximation on small scales, where virialization erases any configuration dependence, but it is expected to break down on larger, weakly non-linear scales, where the elongated pyramids might have different S_N 's than the equivalent cubes (Scoccimarro, Szapudi, & Frieman 1998).

While it is clear from the Figure that the data favor the $\Omega < 1$ models, let us use a toy model of biasing to quantify this statement. This should be reasonably accurate in the weakly non-linear regime, even though the configuration dependence of the higher order moments start to enter the picture. Here we use the ansatz $S_3 = 34/7 - (n_{eff} + 3)$ from EPT, and the leading order bias formula $S_3^g = S_3/b + 3b_2/b^2$ (Fry & Gaztañaga 1993), where the galaxy field is expanded in a Taylor series as $\delta^g = b\delta + b_2\delta^2/2 + \dots$, and the superscript g signifies galaxies. If one formally applies EPT for the (possibly) biased galaxy field, as was done in the case of EDSGC (Szapudi, Meiksin, & Nichol 1996), it is possible to express b_2 in terms of the measured effective indices of the galaxies n_g as

$$b_2 = -\frac{b}{21}(13 - 13b - 7n_{eff} + 7bn_g). \quad (7)$$

In this equation b is fixed by the σ_8 of the simulation, n_{eff} and n_g are the measured effective index in the simulation, and in the galaxy catalog, respectively. Note that the two-point functions of the different time outputs differ essentially only in the amplitude within the studied scale range, thus bias is approximately scaleindependent, and can be described by σ_8 . The results of such a model are shown in Figure 9. b_2 is plotted against scale from $4 - 20h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. Note that the two outlying points above $20h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ on Figure 8. are caused by edge effects in the EDSGC survey Szapudi, Meiksin, & Nichol 1996. The curves in increasing order represent simulations $II_c, II_b, I_c, II_a, I_b, I_a$. The interpretation of the Figure is not straightforward, since the leading order calculations are only expected to work on large scales, where the errors of the EDSGC measurements and the configuration dependence are becoming increasingly influential. Nevertheless, it is intriguing that the $\Omega = 0.3, b = 1$ (II_c) model requires no nonlinear biasing in terms of b_2 within the errors, in contrast with all the other models. Thus it is possible to explain the higher order distribution of counts in cells in the EDSGC without invoking linear or non-linear biasing. The minimal assumption that the EDSGC galaxies trace mass satisfies the above model, but none of the others examined. Occam's razor rejects them as they all need significant non-linear biasing.

Note, however, Figure 9 is not the ultimate answer. More investigations of the non-linear bias are needed, where the above simple theory breaks down, because of the non-linearities and stochasticity. Also, the configuration dependence can be modeled more accurately by the use of artificial catalogs with realistic selection functions, which employ pyramid shape cells as used in the EDSGC. In addition, more data, especially with redshifts, with larger dynamic range towards large scales will turn this argument into a more quantitative result. The possible extensions are left for future work, while the data requirements will be met by the new generation of galaxy surveys. In the near future, the Sloan Digital Sky Survey, and the 2 degree field Survey will

determine the higher order moments with similar accuracy to the present simulations. Comparison of the future data with the results reported here will strongly constrain biasing models.

This paper presented the measurements of cumulants of counts in cells in CDM and Ω CDM simulations. These high resolution simulations together with a pair of new measurement algorithms enabled us to explore a larger dynamic range with smaller errors than previously was possible. A careful attempt was made to determine the range of reliable scales, and a fully non-linear theoretical error calculation was performed as well. It was found that, via perturbation theory and extended perturbation theory, the results can be efficiently represented by the effective index, n_{eff} . In the weakly non-linear regime excellent agreement was found with perturbation theory, while at smaller scales a non-linear plateau found in scale invariant simulations was confirmed. At small scales, the agreement with extended perturbation theory was found to be remarkably good. The CDM results are qualitatively similar to the scale invariant simulations in all respect considered. The time dependency of the cumulants appears to be negligible at all scales, if particle discreteness is correctly taken into account. A comparison with observations revealed that the $\Omega < 1$ model is consistent with the higher order correlations of the EDSGC galaxies without the need of biasing. The rest of the models examined need substantial non-linear biasing to be reconciled with the data. Finally, the error formulae of SC, SCB provide a good approximation for the errors on higher order statistics measured in N -body simulations.

I.S. would like to thank Stephane Colombi for stimulating discussions, Carlton Baugh and Shaun Cole for useful suggestions, and Albert Stebbins for instrumental help. I.S. was supported by the PPARC rolling grant for Extragalactic Astronomy and Cosmology at Durham. This work was also supported by DOE and NASA through grant NAG-5-2788 at Fermilab, and by a NASA HPCC-ESS grant. The simulations were carried out on the Pittsburgh Cray T3E, the Goddard Space Flight Center Cray T3E, and the Cray T3D at the Arctic Regional Supercomputing Center.

6. Appendix

Here we discuss the algorithms used to calculate counts in cells. While from theoretical point of view it would be ideal to use the infinitely oversampling algorithm of Szapudi 1997 to estimate the distribution of counts in cells (SC), this would be unrealistically slow even with present day computers for 47 million particles in three dimension. The algorithms discussed here provide an efficient way to sample with $\simeq 10^{9-14}$ cells in less than 8 CPU hours on a typical workstation with approximately 1GB of memory. The two methods are complimentary to each other, one for large, the other for small scales, with ample overlap between the two. They are outlined next.

6.1. Large Scales (A1)

The algorithm for large scales will be explained in one dimension for simplicity. The generalization for arbitrary dimensions is obvious. The three dimensional version was used in the

calculations of this paper.

The computations are performed on the largest possible grid with N segments which can be fit into the memory of the computer: this determines the smallest possible scale L/N , where L is the box size, and N is the base sampling. A hierarchy of scales are used, with the scale at a given level being twice the scale at one level lower. The results one step lower in the hierarchy are used to keep the number of sampling cells constant even at the largest scales. Counts in cells can be straightforwardly calculated on the resolution scale of the grid, i.e. the smallest scale considered. For the calculation at twice the previous scale the sum of two cells are always stored in one of the cells, for instance in the one with smaller index. Because of the periodic boundary conditions, auxiliary storage is required to calculate the sum of the values in the rightmost cell (if the summations was done left to right), as its right neighbor is the leftmost cell which was overwritten in the first step. After these preparatory steps counts in cells can again be calculated from the N numbers representing partially overlapping cells. For the next level, twice the previous scale, one needs the sum of four original resolution cells: a calculation simply done by summing every other cell of the previous results into one cell. At this level, two auxiliary storage spaces are needed because of the periodicity. In general, at each level in the hierarchy two cells of the previous results are summed as a preparatory step, and counts in cells are calculated simply by computing the frequency distribution of the N sums stored in the main grid. Auxiliary storage is needed for those rightmost cells, which have the periodic neighbors on the left end.

In D dimensions 2^D cells are summed in the preparatory step, and the auxiliary storage space enlarges the original hypercube. In our case the main grid was a 512^3 , resulting in a $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ spacing of 1.3×10^8 cells. Further precision could be achieved by oversampling the original grid, that is, shifting it by a fraction of a resolution cell. Our CPU resources allowed for one independent shifting in each direction, which resulted in an 8 times oversampling of the original grid, that is $C = 1.1 \times 10^9$ cells at each scale from $\simeq 1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ to $\simeq 128h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, i.e. a quarter of the length of the box.

6.2. Small Scales (A2)

The above procedure is limited at small scales by the largest grid that will fit into the memory of the computer. Therefore an alternative technique was adapted for small scales using the original oct-tree data-structure of tree N -body codes. This is an efficient representation of a sparse array, since at small scales most of the cells are empty in a grid spanning the simulation. The tree is built up recursively, by always dividing the particles into two groups based on which half of the volume they belong to. The same function is called on both halves with the corresponding particles until there is no particle in the volume, or the scale becomes smaller than a predetermined value. At each level the scale and the number of particles are known, and when an empty volume is reached, all contained volumes are also empty. These two observations are enough to insert the book-keeping needed to calculate counts in cells at all scales while the tree is built. The number of sampling cells at each level are 2^l , where l is the level; the original box is represented by $l = 0$.

Towards smaller scales the number of cells increases. When $N^3 = 2^l$, where N is the size of the largest grid of the previous algorithm, the two techniques should (and do) give the exact same answers. At larger scales the previous algorithm is superior, since $N > 2^l$, while this algorithm becomes useful at smaller scales. Just as above, this procedure can be further improved by shifting the particles slightly before calculating the tree. However, since this hierarchy of grids has different numbers of cells, random shifts are more advantageous. Shifting by a fraction of the smallest scale would not exhaust the possibilities for any larger scale, while shifting by a fraction of the largest grid might not shift the underlying grids at all. With the introduction of random shifts (oversampling grids), the dynamic range of the two algorithms develops a substantial overlap, which is useful for testing. According to Figure 3. the algorithms produced essentially the same higher order moments in the overlap range of five twofolds.

7. Figure Captions

Figure 1. Counts in cells distribution for simulation I_c (see text) from scales of $7.63h^{-1}\text{kpc}$ doubling up to $125h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ from left to right. The scale corresponds to the size of the cubical window. Algorithm A1 was used for scales $\geq 1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, and A2 was used for the smaller scales. Note that the accuracy is as much as 10^{-14} , and at least 10^{-9} .

Figure 2. Upper Panel: The joining solid and dashed lines display the measured variance $\bar{\xi}$ in cubical cells as a function of scale as calculated with algorithms A1 (solid) and A2 (dashed). The triangles and squares are the predictions from the linear and nonlinear power spectra, respectively. The dotted line is the same for simulation i_0 . Lower Panel: $N_c = \bar{\xi}\bar{N}$ as a function of scale. The line types are the same as for the upper panel.

Figure 3. The cumulants S_N are displayed in increasing order upwards up to 9th order as measured in simulation I_c with algorithms A1 (solid), and A2 (dashed). The dot-dashed lines show the predictions of perturbation theory up to 6th order. The dotted lines are similar measurements in simulation i_0 . The triangles with errorbars display the the average and dispersion of measurements in simulations $i_1 \dots i_5$. Only the upper errorbar is plotted to reduce clutter.

Figure 4. The measurements of S_N , $3 \leq N \leq 10$, in all simulations are plotted with solid lines, in increasing order upwards. The triangles represent the S_N 's from extended perturbation theory, when the best fit n_{eff} is used.

Figure 5. The relative measurement errors are plotted as a function of order. For $N \leq 5$ the errors were calculated with the formulae of SC. The dotted line is a conservative extrapolation of the calculations, which is likely to overestimate the actual errors.

Figure 6. The absolute errors for S_3 and S_4 are plotted for simulations $i_1 \dots i_5$. The lower set of curves represent S_3 , the upper set S_4 . The solid lines show the errors estimated by calculating the variance in the fives simulations. The dotted lines show the theoretical error for each of the five simulations calculated from the measured cumulants self-consistently. The dashed lines are the errors estimated from moments determined by the ensemble average of the five simulations.

Figure 7. The theoretical errors for S_3 and S_4 are shown in simulations $I_a, I_b, I_c, II_a, II_b, II_c$. The lower set of curves refer to S_3 , the upper set to S_4 . Within each set there are two solid lines with approximately matching dotted lines. The higher quadruplet refers to simulations II_* , while the lower one to I_* . The solid lines show the dispersion measured in simulations $i_1 \dots i_5$ scaled with $2\sqrt{(\bar{\xi})}$ of I_c (lower), and II_c (higher), respectively. The three dotted lines in each quadruplet display the different output times a, b, c .

Figure 8. The measurements of the higher order moments are summarized in terms of n_{eff} of EPT. The upper three solid lines with errorbars display the fitted n_{eff} for simulations I_a, I_b, I_c , increasing in this order on scales of $2h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. The lower three solid lines correspond to II_a, II_b, II_c , decreasing in this order on scales of $15h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. The upper dashed line is the theoretical local slope of the power spectrum for the $\Omega = 1$ simulations, the lower three dashed lines are the same

for II_a, II_b, II_c , decreasing in this order. The dotted lines with errorbars show the measurements of n_{eff} in the EDSGC survey. The errorbars on this figure were determined by calculating n_{eff} from S_3 alone, and comparing it with a simultaneous fit using $S_3, \dots, S_6$. The latter is displayed, while the difference of the two is an indication of the accuracy.

Figure 9. The first non-linear coefficient in the Taylor expansion of the bias, b_2 , is displayed for the different simulations as a function of log scale. The curves, in increasing order, are for $II_c, II_b, I_c, II_a, I_b, I_a$.

REFERENCES

- Baugh C.M., Gaztañaga E., Efstathiou G., 1995, MNRAS, 274, 1049
- Bernardeau, F. 1992, ApJ, 292, 1
- Bernardeau, F. 1994, ApJ, 433, 1
- Bernardeau, F. 1995, A&A, 301, 309
- Boschán, P., Szapudi, I., & Szalay, A. 1994, ApJS, 93, 65
- Bouchet F.R., Schaeffer R., Davis M., 1991, ApJ, 383, 19
- Bouchet F.R., Hernquist L., 1992, ApJ, 400, 25
- Bouchet, F.R., Juszkiewicz, R., Colombi, S., & Pellat, R. 1992, ApJ, 394, L5
- Bouchet, F.R., Strauss, M.A., Davis, M., Fisher, K.B., Yahil, A., & Huchra, J.P. 1993, ApJ, 417, 36
- Colombi, S., Szapudi, I., & the Virgo Collaboration 1998 to appear in Proceedings of the ESO/MPA conference “Evolution of Large Scale Structure”, Eds. A.J. Banday et al. (Garching, August 1998, Twin Press)
- Colombi, S., Bouchet, F.R., & Hernquist, L. 1996, ApJ, 465, 14
- Colombi, S., Bernardeau, F., Bouchet, F.R., & Hernquist, L. 1997, MNRAS, 287, 241
- Frieman, J.A., Gaztañaga, E., 1998, in preparation
- Fry, J.N. 1994, Phys.Rev.Lett., 73, 215
- Fry, J.N., & Peebles, P.J.E. 1978, ApJ, 221, 19
- Fry, J.N., & Gaztañaga, E. 1993, ApJ, 413, 447
- Gaztañaga, E. 1992, ApJ, 319, L17

- Gaztañaga, E. 1994, MNRAS, 268, 913
- Gaztañaga E., Baugh C.M., 1995, MNRAS, 273, L1
- Governato, F., Babul, A., Quinn, T., Tozzi, P., Baugh, C.M., Katz, N., & Lake, G., 1998 MNRAS, submitted
- Gunn, J.E., Knapp, G.R. 1993, Sky Surveys: Protostars to Protogalaxies, G. Neugebauer, ed. (San Francisco: Astronomical Society of the Pacific) 267
- Jain, B. 1997, MNRAS, 287, 687
- Juszkiewicz, R., Bouchet, F. R., & Colombi, S. 1993, ApJ, 412, L9
- Kim R.S., Strauss M.A., 1997, submitted to ApJ (astro-ph/9702144)
- Matarrese, S., Lucchin, F. and Bonometto, S.A., 1986, ApJ, 310, L21
- Matarrese, S., Verde, L. , & Heavens, A.F., 1997, MNRAS, 290, 651
- Meiksin, A., Szapudi, I., & Szalay, A., 1992, ApJ, 394, 87
- Matsubara, T. 1995, ApJS, 457, 13
- Peacock, J.A., Dodds, S.J. 1996, MNRAS, 280, 19
- Peebles, P.J.E. 1980, The Large Scale Structure of the Universe (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- Scoccimarro, R., 1998, MNRAS, 299, 1097
- Scoccimarro, R., Colombi, S., Fry, J.N., Frieman, J.A., Hivon, E., Mellott, A., 1998, ApJ, 496, 586
- Scoccimarro, R., Szapudi, I., Frieman, J.A., 1998, in preparation
- Szapudi, I. 1994, Phd thesis
- Szapudi, I. 1997, ApJ, 497, 16
- Szapudi, I. 1998, MNRAS, submitted, (astro-ph/9805090)
- Szapudi, I., Gaztañaga, E. 1998, MNRAS, in press
- Szapudi, I., & Colombi, S. 1996, ApJ, 470, 131 (SC)
- Szapudi, I., Colombi, S., Bernardeau, F. 1998, in preparation (SCB)
- Szapudi, I., Dalton, G., Efstathiou, G.P., & Szalay, A. 1995, ApJ, 444, 520
- Szapudi, I., Meiksin, A., & Nichol, R.C. 1996, ApJ, 473, 15
- Szapudi, I. & Szalay, A. 1993, ApJ, 408, 43

Szapudi, I., Szalay, A.S. 1997a, ApJ, 481, L1

Szapudi, I., Szalay, A.S. 1998, ApJ, 494, L41

Szapudi, I., Szalay, A., & Boschán, P. 1992, ApJ, 390, 350

















